

### **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

Claims 21, 23-25, 27, 29-39, and 44-54 remain pending in this application.

#### **Interview**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview with the undersigned on November 10, 2008. The following includes the substance of that which was discussed during the interview.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 38 and 39 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections. No new matter has been added.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 21-28 and 30-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,324) in view of Klein (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,732). Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al, in view of Klein, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Kuchta et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,319). Claims 53 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al in view of Klein and Matsunami et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0091898). These rejections are traversed as follows.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Hubis does not disclose a plurality of processor adaptors, wherein the number of processor adaptors are increased or decreased independently of the first and second interface adaptor, the memory adaptor and the switch adaptor, based on a required performance. The Examiner relies upon Klein for disclosing the plurality of processor adaptors. However, Klein merely discloses the removal or insertion of a processor module (see column 4, line 56 to column 6, line 12).

In order to more clearly define the present invention over Klein, claim 21 has been amended to recite that "each of said processor adapters has a plurality of microprocessors and, each of said microprocessors is assigned to operate either a first processing load sent from said first interface adapters or a second processing load sent from said second interface adapters in accordance with an amount of the first processing load and an amount of the second processing load." As such, the claims now recite that the microprocessors are assigned based on either a first processing load sent from a plurality of first interface adaptors or a second processing load sent from a plurality of second interface adaptors. The remaining independent claims have a corresponding amendment although slightly different in language.

This assignment of microprocessors based upon distribution of processing load, as recited, is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited references. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By /Shrinath Malur/

Shrinath Malur

Reg. No. 34,663

(703) 684-1120